

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 1 to further clarify the invention and claim 7 to fix a minor informality.

I. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner objected to claim 7 and rejected claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 6 and 14 are allowed.

II. Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to claim 7 because of a minor informality. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this objection in view of the self-explanatory claim amendment being made herein.

III. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,682,171 to Otsuka (hereinafter "Otsuka"). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Independent claim 1 *inter alia* recites: "a controller that makes a predetermined print head, among said plurality of print heads, eject ink to form dots for correcting a feed amount by which said feed mechanism feeds said medium to be printed are formed on said medium to be printed by ejecting ink from a predetermined print head, among said plurality of print heads, while moving said predetermined print head being a print head other than the print head that is the furthest away from said connecting section in a direction perpendicular to the main-scanning direction, among said plurality of print heads."

The Examiner admits that dots for correcting a feed amount by which the feed mechanism feeds the medium to be printed are formed on the medium to be printed by ejecting ink from a predetermined print head, among said plurality of print heads, while moving the moving member is not disclosed by Otsuka but alleges that these features are intended use recitations. The Examiner further suggests that Applicant add a controller to avoid intended use recitation (*see* page 2 of the Office Action).

Applicant respectfully notes that claim 1 no longer includes an intended use recitation but instead recites: a controller that makes a predetermined print head eject ink to form dots for correcting a feed amount by which said feed mechanism feeds said medium to be printed are formed on said medium to be printed by ejecting ink from a predetermined print head, while moving said predetermined print head being a print head other than the print head that is the furthest away from said connecting section in a direction perpendicular to the main-scanning direction, among said plurality of print heads. Otsuka does not disclose or suggest the above-noted unique features of claim 1.

For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Otsuka. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw these grounds of rejection of claim 1. Claim 16 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

#### IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0140794 to Asano et al. (hereinafter “Asano”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,905,186 to Kojima (hereinafter “Kojima”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Independent claim 1 *inter alia* recites: “a controller that makes a predetermined print head, among said plurality of print heads, eject ink to form dots for correcting a feed amount by which said feed mechanism feeds said medium to be printed are formed on said medium to be printed, while moving said moving member, said predetermined print head being a print head other than the print head that is the furthest away from said connecting section in a direction perpendicular to the main-scanning direction, among said plurality of print heads.”

The Examiner admits that dots for correcting a feed amount by which the feed mechanism feeds the medium to be printed are formed on the medium to be printed by ejecting ink from a predetermined print head, among said plurality of print heads, while moving the moving member is not disclosed by Asano but alleges that the feature is an intended use recitation (*see page 4 of the Office Action*).

Applicant respectfully notes that claim 1 no longer includes the alleged intended use recitation but instead recites: a controller that makes a predetermined print head eject ink to form dots for correcting a feed amount by which said feed mechanism feeds said medium to be printed, while moving said moving member, said predetermined print head being a print head other than the print head that is the furthest away from said connecting section in a direction perpendicular to the main-scanning direction, among said plurality of print heads. Asano does not disclose or suggest the above-noted unique features of claim 1.

Kojima does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Asano. Furthermore, Kojima is not prior art with respect to the above-identified application. Applicant respectfully notes that the above-identified application claims priority from Japanese Patent Application filed on October 17, 2002 which is prior to the filing day of Kojima, July 30, 2003. Accordingly, Kojima is not prior art with respect to the above-identified application.

For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Asano in view of Kojima. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-5, 8-13, 15, and 17 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asano and Kojima and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,988,784 to Takemura et al. (hereinafter “Takemura”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Claim 7 depends on claim 1. Applicant has already demonstrated that the combined teachings of Asano and Kojima do not meet all the requirements of independent claim 1. Takemura does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Asano and Kojima. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of claim 1. Since claim 7 depends on claim 1, it is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

V. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 6 and 14.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 26, 2008